

The Examiner acknowledges that Takeda does not teach inversely converting edited display data into a structure of spooled print data, but contends that page 1, lines 14-19 of the APA does. However, Applicant submits that the APA does not suggest such a feature. For example, the APA relates to a process that first converts data into a print control code, and then converted data is spooled and further despoiled before being sent to a printing device. The cited disclosure fails to suggest that the data is inversely converted.

Therefore, even if combined, Takeda and the APA do not suggest all of the features recited in the claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

During a personal interview on June 25, 2003, the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor indicated that in light of the arguments above, the rejections in view of Takeda and the APA are withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to officially acknowledge withdrawal of the rejection in a subsequent Office Action.

B. Claims 2-6

Since claims 2-6 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claim 7

Since claim 7 contains features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable for at least similar reasons.

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/240,695

D. Claims 8 and 9

Since claims 8 and 9 are dependent upon claim 7, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

E. Claim 10

Since claim 10 contains features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable for at least similar reasons.

F. Claims 11-16

Since claims 11-16 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon claim 10, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

G. Claim 17

Since claim 17 contains features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable for at least similar reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/240,695

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Bowles  
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: July 24, 2003